1 2 3 4 5 6	STRANGE & CARPENTER Brian R. Strange (Cal. Bar No. 103252) LACounsel@earthlink.net David A. Holop (Cal. Bar No. 280475) DHolop@strangeandcarpenter.com 12100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1900 Los Angeles, CA 90025 Telephone: (310) 207-5055 Facsimile: (310) 826-3210 Attorneys for Plaintiffs	Joseph H. Malley (not admitted) malleylaw@gmail.com Law Office of Joseph H. Malley 1045 North Zang Boulevard Dallas, TX 75208 Telephone: (214) 943-6100 Facsimile: (214) 943-6170
7	IN THE UNITED ST	TATES DISTRICT COURT
8	FOR THE NORTHERN	DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	OAKLA	AND DIVISION
10	OSCAR HERNANDEZ and LAUREN	Case No. 12-CV-1515-YGR
11	CARTER, individually and on behalf of a class of similarly situated individuals,	CLASS ACTION
12	Plaintiffs,)) PLAINTIFFS OSCAR HERNANDEZ AND
13	v.	LAUREN CARTER'S STATEMENT OF NON- OPPOSITION TO APPLE INC.'S
14		ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER TRANSFERRED OPPERMAN
15	PATH, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	CASE SHOULD BE RELATED
16	Defendant.) Dept.: Oakland Courthouse
17		Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez RogersAction Filed: March 26, 2012
18	MARIA PIROZZI, individually and on) Case No. 12-CV-1529-YGR
19	behalf of a class of similarly situated individuals,	CLASS ACTION
20		
21	Plaintiffs,	PLAINTIFFS OSCAR HERNANDEZ AND LAUREN CARTER'S STATEMENT OF NON-
22	v.	OPPOSITION TO APPLE INC.'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER
23	APPLE INC.,	WHETHER TRANSFERRED OPPERMAN CASE SHOULD BE RELATED
24	Defendant.)
2526		Oakland Courthouse Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers Action Filed: March 27, 2012
27	[additional caption on next page]	
28		
	Plaintiffs' Statement of Non-Opposition to Apple Inc Opperman Case Should Be Related	s Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Transferred

Opperman Case Should Be Related 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 3 OAKLAND DIVISION 4 MARC OPPERMAN, et al., individually) Case No. 13-CV-0453-JST and on behalf of a class of similarly 5 situated individuals, **CLASS ACTION** 6 Plaintiffs, PLAINTIFFS OSCAR HERNANDEZ AND 7) LAUREN CARTER'S STATEMENT OF NON-**OPPOSITION TO APPLE INC.'S** v. 8 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER TRANSFERRED OPPERMAN 9 PATH, INC., a Delaware Corporation, **CASE SHOULD BE RELATED** 10 Defendant.) Dept.: San Francisco Courthouse 11) Judge: Hon. Jon S. Tigar Action Filed: January 31, 2013 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28

Case3:13-cv-00453-JST Document311 Filed04/16/13 Page3 of 3

1	On February 13, 2013, Apple, Inc. filed an administrative motion to relate <i>Hernandez v</i> .		
2	Path, Inc., No. 12-cv-1515-YGR (N.D. Cal.) to the action entitled Opperman v. Path, Inc., No.		
3	4:13-cv-00453-DMR (N.D. Cal.) (Dkt. No. 52). On April 8, 2013, Judge Yvonne Gonzalez		
4	Rogers entered an Order of Referral to Determine Whether Cases Are Related (Dkt. No. 63).		
5	Plaintiffs Oscar Hernandez and Lauren Carter, individually and on behalf of a class of similarly		
6	situated individuals ("Plaintiffs"), recognize that Path, Inc. ("Defendant") is a defendant in both		
7	Hernandez and Opperman. Additionally, while Plaintiffs acknowledge that some factual and		
8	legal issues as they relate to Defendant are similar in both cases, as Defendant admits, some of		
9	the issues in <i>Hernandez</i> are not similar to <i>Opperman</i> . See Def. Path Inc.'s Response in Support		
10	of Apple Inc.'s Mot. to Relate at 2 (Dkt. No. 53) ("Hernandez also makes distinct allegations not		
11	made in <i>Opperman</i> "). However, in light of the language in Civil Local Rule 3-12(a),		
12	Plaintiffs hereby notify the Court that they do not oppose relation of the cases.		
13			
14	Dated: April 16, 2013 Respectfully submitted,		
15	STRANGE & CARPENTER		
16	By: /s/ Brian R. Strange		
17	BRIAN R. STRANGE		
18	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			